

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JOY MYERS,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	No. 2:21-cv-05106
	:	
KILOLO KIJAKAZI,	:	
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,	:	
Defendant.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 6th day of June, 2022, upon consideration of Plaintiff’s Complaint, ECF No. 1, Plaintiff’s Brief and Statement in Support of Request for Review, ECF No. 9, Defendant’s Response to Request for Review, ECF No. 11, and Plaintiff’s Reply, ECF No. 12, and after de novo review¹ of the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of Marilyn Heffley, United States Magistrate Judge, ECF No. 14, Plaintiff’s Objections to the R&R, ECF No. 15, Defendant’s Response to Plaintiff’s Objections, ECF No. 16, and the complete Administrative Record, ECF Nos. 7 and 8, **IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

1. Plaintiff’s objections to the Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 15, are **OVERRULED**;

¹ When objections to a report and recommendation have been filed, “the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *Sample v. Diecks*, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n.3 (3d Cir. 1989); *Goney v. Clark*, 749 F.2d 5, 6-7 (3d Cir. 1984). The “court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings and recommendations” contained in the report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). “District Courts, however, are not required to make any separate findings or conclusions when reviewing a Magistrate Judge’s recommendation de novo under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).” *Hill v. Barnacle*, No. 15-3815, 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 12370, at *16-17 (3d Cir. 2016).

2. The Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 14, is **APPROVED and ADOPTED**;
3. Plaintiff's Request for Review, ECF No. 9, is **DENIED**;
4. The final order of the Commissioner of Social Security is **AFFIRMED**; and
5. This case is **CLOSED**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joseph F. Leeson, Jr.
JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR.
United States District Judge